Louie B. Bishop.
July 28-1893.

New Haven, July 28.

My dear Mr. Brewster:—

Very many
thanks for your kindness in
identifying my lunch Hour,
which reached me safely today.
I expected it would prove
C. falcatus, but think it strange
a breeding bird should be in
such dull plumage.
I noticed no signs of down
about the tufting it, and both
tufts were fully developed.

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

spot which differs favorably in no way from the surrounding country. Shall watch for their fawns next summer to learn if they return to the same place.

Will probably be able to get you some deer this week - or the first of your prize - in exchange if you would like it, but not of fawns, as it might interest some of the members to see them together at the next A.O.U. meeting.

Thanking you again for your kindness

Sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop.

Tuesday Oct 6 My dear Mr Bishop

I have waited very much longer than I expected to answer your letter of Sept 4 when I found the fawn. But I was very busy at that time and the next week I started on my journey which lasted till July 11.

I gladly surrendered it among the birds I shot only for an illustration, design & the wish of the next, and I thought I by once should have better luck. Now particularly interesting & new as showing that the dog-like habit does with us many other birds, has a very effective for some species

77 Whitney Avenue.

New Haven, Conn.

My dear Mr. Beecher: —

I am attempting to answer the Abbé criticism to my remarks on the white eggs of Ceratiocaris Jamesii in the January Auk, and to do this with to learn among what species of North American birds albinistic eggs have been found.

I have so far found very little in ornithological literature on the subject, and would be

If you to write me any instances of albinistic eggs which have fallen under your personal observation.

From what I can learn such eggs seem to be most frequent in species building covered nests, and that through the inheritance of this individual peculiarity back nesting particularly in this bay white eggs in what I believe, and hope to be able to show in a short pamphlet

I only ask of you the names of those in which you remember albinistic eggs to occur,

and hear frequently to each. Please don't attempt to talk this subject up, but you can what information you may happen to learn or hear on this subject.

Trusting this will not be too great an imposition on your kindness

I am sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

February 7. 1894.

Louis B. Bishop
Feby 7-1894

B. Bishop.
Feby 16-1894.

77 Whitney Avenue.
New Haven Conn.

Dear Mr Brewster:-

Many thanks for your nice note of yesterday.

Your answer was just what I wished, as I can look up the literature of the subject myself.

Having just finished looking through nine volumes of the Smithsonian Catalogue - fairly carefully. I find albinistic eggs recorded in twenty-six instances - omitting the Raptores.

Of these seven are Blackbirds, one for Long-billed Marsh Wren - all repeated birds.

In only one other species do I find albinistic eggs twice recorded. the Kingbird, and in most instances only a single egg was of the albino type.

I think I am on the track of an explanation of white eggs in general - omitting the Raptores & Humming-birds, but

perhaps it will all form an ignis fatuus.

As Mr. Allen criticises my view of publicity I wish to defend myself if possible.

Wishing you a most successful trip to Trinidad,

Very sincerely yours

Jesse B. Bullock

February 12 - 1894

P.S. Shall not attempt to say anything further until I have submitted my conclusions to competent authority.

Bishop-L.B.
Dec. 4 1896

77 Whitney Avenue.

New Haven, Dec. 4, 1896.

My dear Mr. Brewster —

My many thanks for your kindness in identifying the shoes I left with you: I was not in the slightest hurry for them.

Shy all answers to your orders.

I must thank you for sending T. v. cuniculorum you had not a duplicate, but thought some might have

received Hastings' case from the Smiths a week. Probably the Railway is coming to you direct, as I think Mr. Albrecht follow him pretty closely.

Thanking you again for your kindness as the A.O.U. Congress,

Very sincerely yours

Frank B. Bickel

I was inclined to consider my Jule, winter bird as a straggler from the West, once more recently to subtorridus, while the two darker, juvenile, rusty fall specimen — probably second year birds — I placed under Swainsonianum. I noted United States given the latter — following the title the check-list — from Newfoundland, while H.C. Oberholser, in his "List of the Birds of Wayne Co., Ohio," called the form three to subtorridus. Such points are, I suppose, really a matter of choice, as it is impossible to tell absolutely one bird

of the same kind. I am inclined this is a matter of judgment with I have kept a series of specimens of this problematic bird, and find Swainsonianum runs from extreme to extreme. I have most material the matching as to wings is marked bird, not how not examined a large series.

The migration of the Louisiana Tanager is one much puzzling and Phillips has always been of interest to me, though I never known much as to migration

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
77 WHITNEY AVENUE.

New Haven, Conn., March 28, 1901.

Dear Dr. Brewster—

May I ask you to identify the Clapper Rails which I am sending you with this? I would have written before sending them, but Dr. Allen tells me you will go to Washington early in April, so I thought it would probably be more convenient for you to see them at once.

Pea Island, where I collected them, is about thirty miles north of Hatteras.

I am inclined to call both, 55125 and 5558 your R. c. waynei, and the other seven this than R. crepitans, but I have seen no identified specimens of the former.

The affinities of the birds of Pea Is. are southern.

Hoping I am not asking too much of your kindness. Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

Bishop, L. B.
Mar. 28, 1901

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., May 24, 1902.

Dear Mr. Brewster—

This afternoon I have sent you 7 Conn. Log-Hills March Wrens, but am afraid only one of them will be of much use to you, as only one was taken in the breeding season. That bird was almost certainly one of the parents of that set of which eggs I gave you some years ago, and it seems to me there is the least a tendency toward Marian's Wren.

The May birds were taken on the breeding-grounds, and probably would have bred here, but of course I can not be certain.

My collection is woefully deficient in breeding birds of all species from Conn. Time and again I have started to fill some vacancies, but when I reached the fields the proofs were so pitiful that each bird had eggs or young

under the care, that my courage failed, and I sneaked home empty-handed.

I have sent you also 8 Long-bills & 1 Worm from North Dakota, 7 of them certainly breeding birds, which you may like to see if you are studying this species from all parts of the country.
Ten females of these birds were recently captured there in Comm. specimens.

I have a specimen of Worthington's Worm taken at Tarpon Springs, Fla., on March 1, and Mariana Heron from Tarpon Springs in Feb. & April, and Pea Island, North Carolina, Taken in Feb. & May.

I will gladly send on any or all of them if they will be of the slightest service to you.
One, April, Tarpon Springs bird was labelled "juv." by the collector, and I think he is right.

How about Howe. I enclose you the two letters I have from him with statements of the size of his collection.

After the first letter I congratulated him on the knowledge he must possess of the habits of our birds if he collected the "seven or eight thousand" himself, which will explain what he says in the second letter.

I am glad to know what figures he has given you for his collection. They are much nearer what I thought probable than those in his letter. I doubt then he meant to write "hundreds" instead of "thousands" in his letter to me, but his pen slipped!

Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

Bishop — Louis B. M.D.

May 24, 1902.

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., Oct. 3. 1902.

Dear Dr. Brewster —

Thanks very much for the copy of your book entitled "Birds of the Cape Region of Lower California".

I have not yet had opportunity to read it, but I am already finding it very useful in connection with some work I am doing on the rangers of the Lumbricidae and Enchytraeidae.

Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

P.S. In North Dakota last June I found a pair of melanistic Ferruginous(?) Roughlegs, and secured the female and four young. Raised the young, which feathered out as dark as the adults. Then killed two and intend to keep the other two till next summer. It looks as if I had a species as good as the Hypoleucus

Bishop Louis B. M.D.
Oct 3, 1902

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., Dec. 10, 1902.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

Many thanks for your interesting letter of the fifth and also for the seven skins of T. m. fagani. The bullet I shall return when I post this. The neck of one of them was injured when it reached me: I trust it was so when it was sent.

All yesterday afternoon and most of this I have spent in a study of my yellow-legs in connection with yours, and have arrived both days at practically the same conclusion — that it is a complete agreement with your view. I think fagani must be accepted as a valid race. The light birds are not characteristic of age. Only one of yours — No. 17865 — (the type)

of both have much longer bills. I disagree entirely with Howe on the subject.

But I have not a single eastern bird that reaches in brightness of coloring, and extent of the colours below any Dakota birds.

How I wished about Dryobates pubescens medianus, and I won't detain you any longer.

Is it not possible that the birds from S. California of whose subspecific identity you were uncertain were quite young?

I have found that the young of D. p. nicrotatus in South Dakota are very slow in attaining the full length of bill.

Of course you have seen more of these birds than I, but I refer almost all New England Hairy taken in late summer or fall to nicrotatus. Certainly the few Hairy that had in New England cannot be the parents of these birds, and their measurements place them with the western bird.

Thanking you again for your kindness in sending the skins, I am sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

P.S. Saw today about 50 Black Ducks - also the Red-legged - shot among the first made by Mr. Sanford at the Long Point Club on the South shore of Lake Erie. The majority were Ducks with red bright red legs and yellowish bills. I suspected all the Gadwall kinds that I saw on this pond, and was glad to learn I was right.

Dec. 15.

Not until today did I find time to look up your Yellow-legs. I send them with this; thanking you again for the privilege of seeing them

E. B. S.

Ridgefield, Conn.
Dec. 10, 1902.

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., March 29, 1903.

Dear Mr. Barge —

Many thanks for your letter of yesterday. Probably you will sanction the non-arrival of any beetles in the time mss, and though I hate to lose the beetles, I should much more dislike to relieve Fairyate disbursed. He is careless I know, and only of commercially energetic, but he is a capital assistant in collecting and collecting tip, and I have greatly enjoyed both summers with him.

He returns kindly both your brother and Mr. Carter, and if gratitude for all they have done for him cannot stimulate him to get you the mammals you want I fear he is hopeless.

Very sincerely yours
Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 20. 1906.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

On my return from Saskatchewan about a week ago I was greatly pleased to find the copy of your "Birds of the Cambridge Region," which you so kindly sent me, and since then I have spent many most enjoyable hours in reading it through from cover to cover. For it is delightful reading from beginning to end, and you are to be envied as much for your grace of diction as your ornithological knowledge. To make a "Local List" "literature" is almost if not quite unique.

I want to thank you also for using extracts from the English names of birds. The tendency to omit these seems to

have become so strong in your question that I began to fear it would win.

I like also your plan of putting "W.R." after a specimen incident to show it sometimes occurs in winter, and I agree most heartily with what you say about the necessity of shooting to establish records unless made by a careful observer, who (1) knows the bird well in the hand, (2) knows well all the kinds of the region where he is reporting it, (3) has handled the bird in the flesh, and (4) sees it under conditions in which its characteristic markings are evident.

That the appearance for years and then disappearance of species from a locality is in the nature of an overflow from their natural habitat I also thoroughly believe. In 1901 I found Black-eared & Lark Buntings common in summer in the Uinta Valley

region of South Dakota, when Eastgate, who has lived there for years, has found them only rarely. That year the conditions there were favorable for their breeding, and the Lark Buntings, I know, raised young; but also the States to the southeast were afflicted by weeks of severe storms during the breeding-season. In 1902 I saw almost none of either species in the same part of South Dakota, and none at all in 1903, and Eastgate assures me he has not found them in the intervening years.

I was very glad also to see that you believe in the migrations of Barred and Long-eared Owls, Hairy & Red-headed Woodpeckers, Flickers, Blue Jays, Crows, Chickadees and White-breasted Nuthatches, for I have been confident for some years that such movements occurred, but have had ornithologists doubt the accuracy of my observations.

either Squire or Tom of New Haven or Cambridge are that birds
are as lively & in plenty during severe as mild winters,
and that in spring at least most of the warblers are
represented by rather small numbers. But I am surprised
to find a number of species have been found wintering at
Cambridge that seem never to do so here, and also to
notice that, I think, for a many you have earlier and in spring
later records in fall than any I have for New Haven.

The migration of Red-headed Woodpeckers in the fall of 1881
was duplicated here, and many remained through 1882.
Now I find it only as a migrant accompanying the fall
flights of Flickers.

Why Red-polls should occur with you fairly frequently,

while I have looked for it here twenty-
five minutes in vain is an hard &
unfair as that Bickmell Church should
be connected with you than the Gray-
churches, and very much nearer here.

But if something one knows there would
would be little to interest one in life, we
had us be thankful there are some
problems left.

I think the Litchfield record you quote
for the Evening Gazette is wrong. I have
investigated it as carefully as I could,
and feel convinced that whatever the
strange trick may have been they were
not Evening Gazettes.

But I have already taken too much
of your time, and all else I will say
is to thank you most heartily for your
admirable books.

Very sincerely yours

Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 27, 1906.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

I was greatly interested in reading of the remarkable "record" that has sprung into existence since your book appeared.

I am not sure that we ought to disregard all "records" unaccompanied by claims, unless made by one known to be a thoroughly competent and careful observer. This will at any rate doubtless make me unpopular in certain quarters, but will render "lists" much more valuable.

Regarding the Litchfield "record" of Evening Grosbeaks I enclose you all the correspondence I had on the subject, and you will note the Rev. Mr. Hotchkiss avoided any guarantee as to what

I shall insert T. sp. pagani in a footnote.

Now a few words on the other species which you mention. Encinetes occidentalis as far as my experience goes seems, to be chiefly confined to the sea-coast, at least east of the Rocky Mts. I have never succeeded in getting a specimen from South Dakota, although I have taken it in Monmouth, Conn., South Carolina & Florida.

I doubt whether most of the birds called Sp. semipalmata from the Atlantic coast really belong to this form, for I question whether young can be separated in fall. I have now 12 adult skins of this bird from South Dakota taken either in spring or summer, and 40 spring birds of Sp. inunctus from South Carolina, the latter selected from several hundred in the flesh. I have never yet had the time to measure them both, but on comparison the difference in length of bill is very slight, if it exists at all. although, as I seem you know, the females

Two full-plumaged birds from North Dakota seem to represent the nuptial plumage, having more white in upper parts, and the dark markings on the lower parts extending farther on the abdomen than in melanolucus from the Atlantic coast in full nuptial dress, and also have dark dots on the white chin, - only rare & typical melanolucus. The bills of these birds seem slightly longer also. You noticed difference in these birds also.

Your third L.H. bird, molting into nuptial dress, seems to me an intermediate and is matched by three birds from Texas, and one from Monomoy in my collection.

Your adult Salt Marsh Sharp-tail juggled me a year ago, when I was working on my Genus Calidris, and now I have you to thank for settling their relationship.

The proof of the book I have been writing with Sanderlings & Pectorals, Limicolae and Rallidae has just come, and

seems to me to be an adult, the other showing traces of the juvenal plumage on the lesser primary coverts. Besides my Leighton birds I have from Newfoundland adult birds old and young in summer and juvenal plumage, passing from these plumages into winter, and in the young bird 6465, which you noticed, complete winter plumage. The plumages of all these birds are homologous and not to be confounded with fragari. Of the latter I have another young bird fairly characteristic taken at about the same time as the others, (you may have noticed all my Hamonton fragari were taken in Sept. '94, and one adult moulting into winter plumage, which I took in Hamonton in '92. The white edgings to the new feathers on the back of this bird are not as broad as in typical fragari, but the general color is almost as pale.

Can I get sheets loaded with the Cargo
sign of sheets in Charleston? and how
much can we get? Nos. 10?.

Cotton, and one exception I suppose
I can get all of I want in Charleston.

Will it be necessary to get a
license to collect birds? and, if so, how
do I go to work? I am out of the Audubon
Society, and have Col Pearson and some
of the others see fully disposed, when I
think of them, so they are likely to
cause me trouble if they get the
chance. Whether they know I am
coming to you I am not aware.

Our weather is frozen up again,
but I trust it is growing warmer with you.

Very truly yours
Louis B. Bishop

Sent mem. Johns. G. J. H.
To Bickmore with my
Johnson, of July 3

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., June 21, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster—

Just before starting for Labrador Bent wrote me & he were that Fleming and Hagen were nominated for A. A. A. Fellows. Six weeks in the field with Hagen showed me his industriation, but also convinced me he ought to be a Fellow — the more so as he cannot frequently attend. But as his chief sponsor you ought, it seems to me, to decide regarding his nomination. I shall be glad to second.

I fear, however, that neither he nor Fleming stand much chance of an election, as the opposition seems very strong.

Very truly yours
Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., July 4, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

I delayed answering your letter of June 26 until I should learn what Hayes decided, and have today received yours of yesterday.

I have written Mr. Allen that you and I have nominated Hayes and should like his name if he feels we ought. Then I will send him the blanks. This is to obviate any danger of the blanks being lost or mislaid.

That Hayes has little or no chance of election I agree with you, but he deserves it, and is so exceedingly anxious to become a Fellow that I am glad to give him what help I can.

thought and I have decided not to nominate Fleming this year, as there seem no present possibility of his election, and the struggle over him might so embitter the opposition as to hurt his chances later.

And this brings me to the "list of suggested candidates," as the election of certain leading names seems to me fraught with danger to the cause of the A.C.U. regarding freedom of balloting. Babenbi book on economic mythology I think the best that has appeared, and should favor his election but for the fact that he is bound so strongly with Anglo-American letters. H. In his report in Bulletin (Nov. Rec. Lab. Bulletin) he said that new Comm. Law was in the line of advanced thought. It allows only

fine of a species to be collected in any one
locality or any other restriction
year, was finished through to my
observer by the Comm. Audubon Society,
and was almost admittedly aimed
at me. The thought made in her
report of the Comm. Soc. in the same
number of Bird-Lore some statements
regarding Comm. collectors that seemed
to me outrageous, and the Directors of
the Nat. Aud. Soc. refused to take
any action in the matter. So I
resigned from the Nat. Aud. Soc.

As long as Forbush depends largely
for his support on a society that is
inimical to collecting I feel I can
not fit & be a Fellow.

The other man is Forster. I like
the latter exceedingly, and think he
is one of the most charming fellows
I ever met, and believe he is a

good ornithologist. His pictures, I confess, I do not think equal to some of Allan Brooks. But I do not think he ought to be elected a Fellow until he has done as good scientific work as others on the list. That Chapman will use his influence and that of the Audubon Society for them seem I take for granted. I like both, and do not wish to vote against either, but it seems to me neither should come in at present.

On the other hand Baba I am more voter than any one else on the list, and surely ought to be elected, but he was not nominated last year, and may not be this: at least I do not know of any one who is backing him.

How you feel in this matter of course I do not know, but if you approve I will either go to see her Bishop & have you or communicate with him, and learn whether she is to be nominated by any one.

Then, too, something ought to be done regarding nominations & the class of members, that we may not be in the same unfortunate position as last year.

Any names you may select for nomination to this class I shall be glad to attend, and will send the list to Knight as I go for their signatures. I am not anxious to do this. I only want it certain that some one be nominated.

Very sincerely yours
Louis B. Bishop

P.S. I enclose a copy of the new Com. Law, which please return.

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., July 9, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster —

Your interesting letter of July 5 came yesterday, and I thank you for the full expression of your views regarding Double "Fellows".

The three nominations for membership I have signed, and return with them, that you may send them to Warren for me. Dr. Phillips certainly should be made a member. I have forborne his papers in the Club with much interest, and have noticed that he has an unusually wide knowledge for an American mythologist. And the same is true of Kennard. He certainly is greatly interested in mythology, and attends the Union meetings faithfully.

Regarding Mr. Wright I have had many doubts. I read his "Birds of the Boston Public Garden" with interest, amazement and skepticism; and the latter was increased when I learned he did not collect. I have made so many mistakes in the field myself that I am longer have much confidence in unsupported records of any one unless one shot the bird in question, unless, possibly, when the observer has had great experience both in the field and in studying skins.

Only this spring I shot both a Red-eyed Vireo and a female Scarlet Tanager because after studying them for some time through glasses I became convinced they were not those species whatever else they might be.

Also I have been told by some local ornithologist that Mr. Wright was the only one who could find these

in lieu of their species in life. His first letter was so unsatisfactory a reply to the question I asked, which I did as one of the State Ornithologists, that I laid him on in my record and "laid on" him in my thirst — which he did not answer.

Mr. E. Seymour Woodruff, who is a capital field ornithologist, careful, and with the best ears and eyes I know, when summer home in Litchfield, told me on the coincident the Rev. Chichester an Audubon enthusiast, liable to be carried away by his zeal. He kindly visited Mr. Woodruff for me, got a careful description of the birds seen, and compared it with my claim of Evening Grosbeaks, and was convinced it did not apply.

Please return these letters at your convenience.

Very sincerely yours
Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 ORANGE STREET.

New Haven, Conn., July 10, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster—

I have just heard from Dr. Allen, who says he will gladly sign Wayne Lafer, and I am sending him it tonight. He writes that he thinks he has already got Wayne in connection, Dr. Elliot & Dr. Lucas being the other signers, Dr. Hengst and Mr. Chapman having declined to sign.

With this backing Wayne ought to have an excellent chance of election, and he certainly would be glad to know that each man on back of him, if you think best & tell him.

I wrote him only today in case we could do what we could, but I fancy he had small chance of election.

Sincerely yours
Louis B. Bishop

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 14, 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster—

As I found I could not get to Newgate I wrote to Mr. Babb soon after my last letter to you. Strange to say no reply has come, and the limit for depositing Fellow has expired. Probably Mr. Babb is away.

The letter of Chapin reached me safely, and from him has come a list of all their Audubon papers, of letter in all. If you think it advisable for me to send it to Mr. Hurlbut and ask him to let other Washington ornithologists see it I will do so. Otherwise I will keep it till the A. O. U. meeting.

Hague is certainly a keen critic in some ways. He writes me he has found already over one hundred errors in the new edition of Chaperon's "Handbook"; and he showed to me that Wright was wrong in certain questions of morals.

As neither of them will vote for him anyway I rather think I shall maintain their Scotch at the meeting.

Heartily yours
Louis B. Bishop.

P.S.

I so much approved of Chaperon's editorial in case in identification in ~~that~~ the last Bird-Lore, that I wrote & thanked him for it. Probably he won't care for my approval, but I satisfied my own sense of justice.

L.B.B.

LOUIS B. BISHOP, M.D.,
356 Orange Street.

New Haven, Conn., Aug. 26. 1912.

Dear Mr. Brewster—

Magnus did not send me a list of the "100 errors" he had discovered in Chapman's new book, and then he did mention one, as I remember them, trivial. The trouble with Magnus is that he is always looking for errors, is very bitter against all that oppose him, and is likely to be bitter against those that try to help him if they fail to do what I planned to do was to show the fallacy of Magnus' methodological knowledge not by disparaging Knight's and Chapman's work but by praising it. This would increase Magnus' reputation, perhaps assure the fellows a little of Knight's and Chapman's expense, and make it difficult for them to oppose him.

Personally I think Chapman has about the
most unlovely character I ever met, and
I studied him carefully last spring.
but he is a good ornithologist.
On this ground I shall work as hard
as I can for his election; still, I hardly
feel it fair to the Fellows to do so
without telling them frankly what
I learned of the man. On the other
hand the latter course seems hardly
square to Chapman, as it is an ornithologist
and not a man that they ought to
vote for him, and he will not be
able to attend the meeting. If I
have a chance to talk with you before
the vote I will tell you of my
impressions last spring.

Chapman would seem a very fit candi-
date in itself & my praise of his editorial
has one respect his ability more than I,
and I fully admit that he has a
very difficult task to keep his Auk above

people contended and that kept the records in Bird-Lore reliable. I think it a most interesting and instructive magazine, and that it reflects great credit on him in many ways.

What I object to is that he has caused at least to his Audubon supporters & guild & the popular clamor against collecting, for which clamor I hold the leaders of the Audubon Society largely if not wholly responsible.

From Mr. Bent I have had a most appreciative letter from London, where he is studying the Pheasants for his monograph. But I feel I ought to quote some sentences, for if ever Tolle his fantasie "Fellow" would be true because is true! "I am extremely grateful for your offer to nominate me as a Fellow of the A.O.U. but I would really prefer you not to do it. As Mr. Brewster has told me there has been some objection urged on the part

of some member a member and I would much prefer to remain in my present position. So if any one should nominate me I should be very much obliged if you would communicate my wishes in the subject & whatsoever is concerned."

Of course it is now too late to do anything this year, but when I see him I will discuss the matter with him more fully.

No doubt it will interest you to know of a most interesting specimen that arrived here last week. It is a baby boy that has Bishop thinks is the most wonderful way, and I have no desire to exchange him. I am happy to say Mother and baby are doing finely.

Sincerely yours

Loren B. Bishop